DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 650 CS 506 662

AUTHOR Arnold, Christa L.; Fadely, Dean
TITLE You're No Jack Kennedy: Bentsen vs. Quayle.
PUB DATE Oct 89
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Culture Association (Jacksonville, FL, October 5-7, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Debate; Discourse Analysis; *Persuasive Discourse; *Political Candidates; *Presidential Campaigns (United States); Rhetorical Criticism
IDENTIFIERS Apologia; Bentsen (Lloyd); *Compliance Gaining; Political Communication; Quayle (Dan); Rhetorical Strategies; *Vice Presidential Debates

ABSTRACT

The 1988 Vice-Presidential debate between candidates Dan Quayle and Lloyd Bentsen served as a rhetorical forum for airing the policies and behaviors of each candidate. Elements of compliance-gaining and apologia were interrelated and overlapped throughout the debate. Both candidates effectively maneuvered these strategies and avoided direct questioning of one another in the majority of their exchanges. Several findings emerge from assessing the debate: (1) both candidates demonstrated a conscious intent to persuade, manage conflict, manipulate responses, and gain compliance; (2) Senators Lloyd Bentsen and Dan Quayle both applied strategies of compliance-gaining and apologia as manipulative rhetorical tools; and (3) the rhetorical discourse in this debate also demonstrated the use of a sub-genre of apologia, specifically compliance-gaining apologia, as opposed to apologias of confession, denial, or regret. (Thirty-four notes are included.) (Author/MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307650

YOU'RE NO JACK KENNEDY: BENTSEN VS QUAYLE

by

Christa L. Arnold and Dean Fadely

Division of Communication Studies

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Accepted for presentation as a paper for:

The 1989 Convention of:

The American Culture Association

Jacksonville, Florida, U.S.A.

October 5-7, 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christa Arnold

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS506662

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

The Vice-Presidential Debate served as a rhetorical forum for airing the policies and behaviors of each candidate. Elements of compliance-gaining and apologia were interrelated and overlapped throughout the debate. Both candidates effectively maneuvered these strategies and avoided directly addressing the majority of their questions. Several findings emerge from assessing the 1988 Vice-Presidential Debate: (1) Both candidates demonstrated a conscious intent to persuade, manage conflict, manipulate responses, and gain compliance. (2) Senator's Lloyd Bentsen and Dan Quayle applied strategies of compliance-gaining and apologia as manipulative rhetorical tools. And, (3) finally, the rhetorical discourse in this debate also demonstrated the use of a sub-genre of apologia, specifically compliance-gaining apologia, as opposed to apologias of confession, denial or regret.

"Debates" have become a pervasive part of campaigning for major offices.[1] Political debates normally consist of a panel of journalist who ask the candidates questions. The candidates normally have a specific amount of time in which to respond.[2] Therefore, goalsetting and strategy selection are two complicated and important elements for the participants of the political debate. Advisors help map out strategies for the candidates, and try to prepare the participants with appropriate responses in defense of character, policy, or past behavior.[3] The Vice-Presidential Debate between Senator Lloyd Bentsen, and Senator Dan Quayle, makes for an especially interesting case study involving the integration of apologia strategies, and compliance-gaining tactics, in an effort to gain listener compliance for the Vice-Presidential candidates, their parties, and their Presidential running mates.

Office-seekers are often subjected to constant questioning regarding such things as, inconsistencies in their statements, voting records, and past behaviors.[4] If the press discovers an inconsistency, flaw, or fault, (let alone evidence of sexual misconduct), in a candidates backdground, the media can repeat and transmit this information all over the country. Thus, even a frivolous accusation can be potentially damaging for an office-seeker.[5]

Faced with such political melodrama, the candidates must protect their reputation by verbally defending against charges damaging to their character. Any attack casting suspicion upon one's moral character may hinder the office-seeker's ability to achieve goals and function as a public leader.[6] Ellen Gold has argued:

> Since contemporary practice so emphasizes the aspirant's personal qualities, his 'moral nature, motives and reputation,' and since the media are best able to stir up conflict and interest by exploring such personal attributes, apologetic strategies serve in an important fashion to keep a candidacy viable.[7]

Strategies, situational factors, overlapping functions, and the interrelation of elements obviously play an important role in the effectiveness of any particular rhetorical act regardless of it's classification. The following discussion will examine the strategies and elements involved in two specific types of rhetorical acts: apologia and compliance-gaining. The discussion will include: (1) a review and discussion of major works and strategies involved in the genre of apologia, (2) a review and discussion of the major works and strategies of compliance-gaining discourse, and (3) an assessment of The 1988 Vice-Presidential Debate[8] applying elements of apologia and compliance-gaining.

APOLOGIA

Ware and Linkugel, in their well know article "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves," argued that "apologetical discourses constitute a distinct form of public address, a family of

speeches with sufficient elements in common so as to warrant legitimate generic status."[9] Subsequently, Noreen Kruse defined apologia as:

> ...public discourse produced whenever a prominent person attempts to repair his character if it has been directly or indirectly damaged by overt charges, or rumors and allegations which negatively value his behavior and/or his judgment.[10]

Authors Harrell, Ware, and Linkugel contended that if this rhetor is a political figure, then s/he has a responsibility to maintain his/her personna along personal, ideological, and structural lines.[11] Ellen Gold further argued:

> ...the candidate's attempt to defend his policy soon becomes an effort to defend his actions and his character, justify his motives and intent--in short, an apologia.[12]

Harrell, Ware, and Linkugel defined political apologia as:

> ...that form of discourse in which a rhetor presents a personal defense of his worth, one distinctly different from a defense of programs and policies, apologia serves the unique role in our political system of being the rhetorical instrument best suited to the maintenance of rhetorical personae against charges that an individual is personally unsuited to wear the public mask and, hence, not fit for public trust and office.[13]

The varying strategies, situations, and circumstances surrounding apologia's help make each one unique. However, regardless of the extent of their individuality, all apologia's rely upon the use of four strategies: denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence.[14] These strategies may be used separately, simultaneously, or they may overlap one another.

The discourse of denial consists of the "...simple disavowal by the speaker of any participation in, relationship to, or positive sentiment toward whatever it is that repels the

audience." [15] Gold has contended that, in political campaigns, denials may take a variety of forms:

> One may deny the facts, setting forth a different version... If the facts seem indisputable, one may deny 'intention,' arguing that the statement or action has been misunderstood or misinterpreted. [16]

Bolstering as a component of apologia is applied when a "speaker attempts to identify himself with something viewed favorably by the audience." [17] The candidate may bolster and strengthen his or her case by using symbolic strategies such as being photographed with persons whose reputations lend credibility to the office-seeker's defense, or using well-respected members of the community to testify about the candidate's past behavior. [18]

Differentiation "...subsumes those strategies which serve the purpose of separating some fact, sentiment, object or relationship from some larger context within which the audience presently views that attribute." [19] In political campaigns, "...the candidate may try not only to redefine the larger context for the audience, but to separate himself symbolically from the accusation by attacking the source." [20]

The final strategy of apologia is transcendence, which is the obverse of differentiation, and is transformative in the sense that strategies which "...involve a change in cognitive identification and in meaning factor together as transcendence." [21]

As apologia involves a rhetor's attempt to reverse a

derogatory charge, thus resulting in a more favorable view of the speaker's character, elements of manipulation and compliance-gaining appear in most political/apology speeches. Therefore, an examination of the charactistics, strategies, and situational appropriateness of the rhetorical acts of compliance-gaining is in order.

COMPLIANCE-GAINING

In addition to defending one's reputation, a candidate also attempts to gain audience compliance, (compliance through votes, campaign donations, or both), and therefore may apply several strategies of compliance-gaining as rhetorical tools. Compliance-gaining can be described as symbolic behavior aimed towards shaping or regulating the behavior and/or opinion of others. Compliance-gaining has also been described as "...strategic verbal choice-making" which plays a key role in communication."[22] There are a variety of situations in which a candidate seeks compliance from the listeners. This compliance-gaining act may take the form of a request, or "favor-asking," but, regardless of how the act is presented, the structure is self-serving.[23] Compliance-gaining behavior centers upon an attempt on the part of the communication source to effect a preconceived response from the target or receiver of the persuasive effort.[24]

Gerald Marwell and David Schmitt developed sixteen compliance-gaining strategies. The compliance-gaining strategies

most relevant to the political spectrum extend beyond the dyadic encounter, and are geared more toward the group or large audience. These strategies are based upon sanction (promise, ingratiation, esteem, aversive stimulation, and guilt), and need (altruism, and explanation).[25] To better understand these particular compliance-gaining strategies, each one will be examined separately.

Promise consists of a situation in which the:

> Actor's proffered goods, sentiments, or services are promised to the target in exchange for compliance. This may include a bribe or trade-off, log-rolling, or finding a 'middle of the road' solution.[26]

Ingratiation is a strategy of sanction in which the:

> Actor's proffered goods, sentiments, or services precede the request for compliance. They range from subtle verbal or non-verbal positive reinforcement to more blatant formulas of 'apple-polishing' or 'brown-nosing.'[27]

Esteem constitutes a case in which the:

> Target's compliance will result in automatic increase of self-worth. Actor's appeal promises this increase in areas of target's power, success, status, moral/ethical standing, attention and affection of others, competence, ability to handle failure and uncertainty will, and/or attempts to aspire.[28]

With aversive stimulation, both verbal and non-verbal tactics can be applied:

> Actor continuously punishes target, making cessation contingent on compliance: pouting, sulking, crying acting angry, whining, the 'silent treatment,' and ridicule would all be examples of aversive stimulation.[29]

The final sanction strategy, guilt, consists of a situation in which the:

> Target's failure to comply will result in automatic

> decreases of self-worth. Areas of inadequacy might include professional ineptness, social irresponsibility, or ethical/moral transgressions.[30]

There are also strategies based on need. Altruism is a need strategy in which:

> Actor requests the target to engage in behavior designed to benefit the actor rather than the target. Presentation of some personal need and asking for help is typical. Intensity of the appeal may be manipulated by making the target feel unselfish, generous, self-sacrificing, heroic, or helpful. 'It would help me if you would do this,' and 'do a favor for me,' exemplify the direct approach of the altruistic strategy.[31]

The final need strategy, explanation, suggests that:

> One of the several reasons are typically advanced for believing or doing something. A reason may include the following: (1) credibility, 'I know from experience.' The reason for complying is because of trust worthiness, integrity, exemplary action, or expertise; (2) inference from empirical evidence, 'Everything points to the logic of this step.' The reason for complying is based on the following evidence.[32]

The literature treating apologia and compliance-gaining indicates that the effectiveness of each strategy varies depending on individual and situational differences. The media can make political candidates prime targets for a variety of attacks on virtually every aspect of their public or private lives. If the press discovers a potentially damaging material, they will pursue the candidate with relentless energy. To combat persistent scrutiny by the press, candidates, and their advisors, implement particular rhetorical tactics. If political figures are attacked, especially in a debate setting, apologia strategies may be selected as a rhetorical tool to help defend

the candidate's reputation. With apologia, the sense of preserving one's character appears to be a primary motive, however, most politcal/apologetic rhetoric goes beyond self-preservation and into audience compliance. If this is the case, then the office-seeker's may select strategies with the intent to persuade or gain compliance. In this situation, the strategies of compliance-gaining may be effective. In fact, political candidates may target compliance as the primary goal using a mixture of strategies such as denial, transcendence, explanation, and acknowledgement of error, fault, or even guilt, ("mea culpa") as a method of self-preservation. Is it possible, that in certain situations of public discourse, strategies of apologia and compliance-gaining overlap and are mutually inclusive? This question can be answered, at least partially, by evaluating The 1988 Vice-Presidential Debate between Democratic Senator Lloyd Bensten, and his Republican counterpart Senator Dan Quayle. This assessment will help to better understand any interrelationships between political apologia and compliance-gaining discourses.

THE 1988 VICE-PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE

The two candidates met on October 5, 1988 in Omaha, Nebraska, for the third nationally televised Vice-Presidential debate in history,[33] and their only scheduled joint appearance. The debate panel consisted of: moderator Judy Woodruff, of the "McNeil/Lehrer News Hour" and "Frontline"; Jon Margolis, of the

Chicago Tribune; Tom Brokaw, of **NBC News**; and Brit Hume, of **ABC News**. Judy Woodruff began the debate stressing the importance of the Vice-Presidential candidates stating that "...based on history since WW II, there is a 50-50 chance that one of the two men here tonight will become President of the United States." On that serious note, she directed the first question to Senator Quayle:

WOODRUFF: Senator, you have been criticized, as we all know, for your decision to stay out of the Vietnam War, for your poor academic record. But more troubling to some are some of the comments that have been made by people in your own party...Why do you think that you have not made a more substantial impression on some of these people who have been able to observe you up close?

QUAYLE: The question goes to whether I am qualified to be vice president and, in the case of a tragedy, whether I'm qualified to be president. Qualifications for the office of vice president or president are not age alone...I have more experience than others that have sought the office of vice president. Now let's look at qualifications and let's look at the three biggest issues...I have more experience than does the governor of Massachusetts....

Quayle applied indirect denial in responding to Woodruff's accusations of avoiding the war, poor grades, and he did so by transcending the question from why he has not made an impression on his own party, to, "the question goes to whether I'm qualified to be vice president." He transcended the question even further by discussing another issue; "Now let's look at qualifications and the three biggest issues...." Quayle differentiated himself from war evader and poor student, to the candidate in control of the issues. Quayle bolstered himself and tried to build his esteem by claiming that he has "more experience" than Governor

Dukakis. Quayle used the strategy of altruism ("trust me, I know from experience").

Judy Woodruff delivered her next question to Senator Bentsen:

WOODRUFF: Senator Bentsen....this is not so much on your qualifications, but your split on policy with Governor Dukakis...you disagree with him on major issues...If you had to step in to the presidency, who's agenda would you pursue? Yours or his?

BENTSEN: Well, I am delighted to respond to that question, because we agree on so many things, and the vast majority of the issues...Governor Dukakis has been able to cut the (Massachusetts) deficit ten times in a row...that is a major sense of achievement, and I admire that...Dukakis and I agree that we ought to have a trade policy for this country, that we've seen this administration more than double the national debt...And as I work to pass a trade bill through the Senate...we (Dukakis and Bentsen) passed a trade bill...we stand tough for America...we're going to open markets...We'll show leadership in that respect...That's the sort of thing that Michael Dukakis and I will do....

Bentsen immediately ingratiated Woodruff and transcended the audience away from the questioner's immediate accusation with his opening sentence. He demonstrated an effective use of indirect denial by not admitting that Dukakis and Bentsen disagreed on major policies, and instead, the Senator discussed all of the issues that they agreed upon. Bentsen differentiated himself from working against Dukakis's policies, and presented an image of Dukakis/Bentsen as a team fighting for a better America. He also ingratiated and bolstered Dukakis by using statements of admiration and achievement, while at the same time, building personal esteem by discussing his work on passing a trade bill. Strategically, Senator Bentsen indirectly transcended guilt to the current Reagan/Bush administration with his accusations about

the current national debt. This statement separated and differentiated not only the candidates, but the administrations as well. Bentsen closed with a promise that the Dukakis/Bentsen ticket will show leadership.

Jon Margolis asked a question concerning environmental issues directed to Senator Quayle:

MARGOLIS: Senator, since coming to the Senate, you have voted against environmental protection legislation about two-thirds of the time. These include votes against pesticide controls, the toxic-waste Superfund, the health and safety protection from nuclear wastes. Senator, do you consider yourself an environmentalist? And, if you do, how do you reconcile that with your voting record?

QUAYLE: I have a very strong record on the environment in the United States Senate, I have a record where I voted against my president on the override of the Clean Water Act. I have voted for...and I support this administration in its environmental effort...I take my children hiking, fishing, walking in the woods, in the wilderness. Believe me, we have a committment to preserving the environment...let me tell you about his (Dukakis's) environmental policy...the Boston Harbor which is the dirtiest waterway in America...Who has the environmental interests?...George Bush and I do.

Quayle immediately bolstered and ingratiated himself by stating that he has a strong voting record, while indirectly denying any accusations contrary to a strong evironmental record. He transcended the audience away from Quayle the anti-environmentalist, to Quayle, the enviromental father who shares natures wonders with his children. This also builds his self-esteem as the concerned Senator and father. With differentiation, the Senator's "believe me, we have a committment to preserving the environment," allowed the listeners to infer

that the Bush/Quayle team are environmentalists, while at the same time, shifting guilt and blame over to Dukakis's poor environmental administration, specifically, the Boston Harbor.

Britt Hume asked Senator Bentsen a question concerning the $10,000 Breakfast Club:

HUME: Senator, I want to take you back...to the celebrated 'Breakfast Club'...You said it was a mistake and you ...called the whole idea off...The question I have is, if the **Washington Post** had not broken that story and other media picked up on it,...would you still be having those breakfasts to this day?

BENTSEN: (Laughs) Well, I must say Britt, I don't make many mistakes, but that one was a real doozie...And I agree with that...And as you know, I immediately disbanded it...So I would work very hard to see that we disbanded the entire situation...I'd work for that end and that's what my friend from Indiana has opposed repeatedly, vote after vote.

Bentsen demonstrated concession and aversive stimulation by laughing, then follwed with an admission of guilt concerning the "Breakfast Club." The Senator made a verbal promise to work hard on disbanding the "entire situation," which helped build back his esteem. He then transcended the blame and guilt of this issue over to Dan Quayle.

Several times during the debate, Senator Quayle was asked what he would do if he became President.[34] Quayle cited his experience, but always seemed to transcend his response in directions other than a direct answer to this particular question. Tom Brokaw asked Dan Quayle to respond to this important question, and the response led to the most memorable portion of this debate.

BROKAW: Senator Quayle, I don't mean to beat this drum until it has no more sound left in it, but to follow up on Brit Hume's question, when you said that it was a hypothetical situation, it is sir, after all, the reason that we're here tonight, because you are running not just for vice president. And, if you cite the experience that you had in Congress, surely you must have some plan in mind about what you would do if it fell to you to become President of the United States as it has so many vice presidents just in the last 25 years or so.

QUAYLE: Three times that I have had this question and I'll try to answer it again for you as clearly as I can because the question you're asking is...what kind of qualifications do I have and what would I do in this kind of a situation...I would make sure that the people in the cabinet and the people and advisers to the president are called...I'll talk to them...And I will know them on a first hand basis...I will have day-to-day activities with all the people in government...I will be prepared not only because of my service in the Congress, but because of my ability to communicate and to lead...It is not just age, it's accomplishments, it's experience...I have as much experience in the Congress as Jack Kennedy did when he sought the presidency...I will be prepared to deal with the people in the Bush administration...

The mere fact that this was the "third" attempt to answer this pertinent question demonstrated the consistent usage of denial and transcendence tactics. Quayle denies not having answered this question previously. As a strategy to avoid answering the question at hand, he attempted to transcend the audience away from "what would Dan Quayle do as president," to, "what kind of qualifications does Dan Quayle have." He explained what he would do, and again bolstered the same qualifications that he gave in the beginning of the debate. The Senator transcended even further and tried to bolster his image with extreme esteem, by insinuating that Dan Quayle has as much

experience to seek this positon as did Jack Kennedy. Senator Bentsen replied to Dan Quayle's comparison:

BENTSEN: Senator, I served with Jack Kennedy, I knew Jack Kennedy. Jack Kennedy was a friend of mine. Senator, you're no Jack Kennedy....

QUAYLE: That was really uncalled for Senator.

BENTSEN: You're the one that was making the comparison, Senator, and I'm the one who knew him well... I did not think the comparison was well taken.

Bentsen effectively differentiated Dan Quayle, the young inexperienced Senator, from Jack Kennedy, "the legend." He explained that Jack Kennedy was a friend, and bolstered his connection with Kennedy in order to transcend the guilt over to Quayle. Bentsen made the inference that Senator Quayle was guilty of "riding on the coatails" of a well known president and Democrat for the sake of building his own esteem. Senator Quayle demonstrated aversive stimulation with his remark, "that was really uncalled for..." delivered in a "sulking" tone of voice. Admitting guilt for the "other guy" is a reoccuring theme used by both Senator's in this debate, and can be described as a reverse apologia -- or opponent apologia.

The Vice-Presidential Debate served as a rhetorical forum for airing the policies and behaviors of each candidate. Elements of compliance-gaining and apologia were interrelated and overlapped throughout the debate. Both candidates effectively maneuvered these strategies and avoided directly addressing the majority of of the questions asked of them. Several findings emerge from

assessing the 1988 Vice-Presidential Debate: (1) Both candidates demonstrated a conscious intent to persuade, manage conflict, manipulate responses, and gain compliance. (2) Senator's Lloyd Bentsen and Dan Qualye applied strategies of compliance-gaining and apologia as manipulative rhetorical tools. And, (3) finally, the rhetorical discourse in this debate also demonstrated the use of a sub-genre of apologia, specifically compliance-gaining apologia, as opposed to apologias of confession, denial or regret.

NOTES

[1]For example see: Myles Martel, Political Campaign Debates: Images, Strategies, and Tactics, (New York: Longman Press, 1983). See also: The entire issue of Speaker and Gavel 24 (1986), with articles by J. Jeffrey Auer, Dayle Hardy-Short, Brant Short, Mary M. Gill, and Stephen Mills, which is one of many publications treating the subject of political campaign debates.

[2]This form of political debate, the "press conference" or "panel" format, has been widely criticized in both scholarly and popular publications. In addition to the sources cited above in note 1, see: William F. Buckley, Jr., "Presidential 'Debates' are just Superficial Exchange," Greensboro News and Record, September 19, 1988, p. A11. John Alexander, "Forget Issues, Bring Tissues," Greensboro News and Record, September 25, 1988, pp. E1 and E8; George F. Will, "Over-programmed Quayle Spouted a Lot of Nothing," Greensboro News and Record, October 9, 1988, p. E5; Meyer Rangell, "Surely Lincoln-Douglass Roll in Their Graves," New York Times, October 21, 1988, p. E5.

[3]Myles Martel, Political Campaign Debates: p. 57.

[4]Ellen Reid Gold, "Political Apologia: The Ritual of Self-Defense," Communication Monographs, 45, (1978): p. 306.

[5]Ibid., p. 308.

[6]Ibid., p. 308.

[7]Ibid., p. 316.

[8]"Quayle and Bentsen, Running Mates Under Fire," Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, 46, (October 8, 1988): pp.2832-2842. This is the transcript of the entire Vice-Presidential Debate provided by the Associated Press. All references made to the Bentsen-Quayle debate are from this transcript.

[9]B.L. Ware and Will A. Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On the Generic Criticism of Apologia," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (1973): p. 275.

[10]Noreen W. Kruse, "Motivational Factors in Non-Denial Apologia," Central States Speech Journal, 28 (1977): p. 13. She has also described the genre of apologia as "...a grouping of speeches based on situations and circumstances surrounding a speech defending one's character, and mending of one's ethos." "The Scope of Apologetic Discourse: Establishing Generic Parameters," Southern Speech Communication Journal 46 (1981):

p. 279. For further evaluations and discussions of apologia, see: B.L. Ware and Wil A. Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On the Generic Criticism of Apologia"; B.L. Jackson Harrell, B.L. Ware, and Wil A. Linkugel, "Failure of Apology in American Politics: Nixon on Watergate," Communication Monographs 42 (1975): 245-261; Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978); Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Form and Genre, (Falls Church, Virginia: Speech Communication Association, 1976); Bernard Brock and Robert Scott, A Twentieth-Century Criticism, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1980); Robert L. King, "Transforming Scandal into Tragedy: A Rhetoric of Political Apology," Quarterly Journal of Speech 71 (1985): 289-301.

Authors' Harrell, Ware and Linkugel (1975) discussed apologia as a strategic verbal defense in which the "rhetor fashions to extricate himself from the situation" (p. 246). These authors contended that personal legitimacy is most basically grounded in "perceived honesty, largely a moral perception of the rhetor drawn by the public" (p. 260). Noreen Kruse (1981) specified that "discourses can only be defined as apologia if the rhetor's actions have led to public criticism of their characters or if the rhetors believe their behaviors have caused people to consider them immoral or unethical" (p. 280). However, Ware and Linkugel (1973) suggest that questioning a man's moral nature and worth as a human being is qualitatively different from challenging his policies. Therefore, an attack on a person's character, moral nature, and reputation requires a direct response (p. 274). Usually this direct response is in the form of a public address involving elements such as self defense, apology, and an emphasis on the positive aspects of this person's character.

[11]Jackson Harrell, B.L. Ware, and Wil A. Linkugel, "Failure of Apology in American Politics," p. 261.

[12]Ellen Gold, "Political Apologia: The Ritual of Self-Defense," p. 307.

[13]Jackson Harrell, B.L. Ware, and Wil A. Linkugel, "Failure of Apology in American Politics," p. 251.

[14]B.L. Ware, and Wil A. Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves," pp. 276-282.

[15]Robert P. Abelson, Theories of Cognitive Consistency, (Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally, (1969), pp. 344-345.)

[16]Ellen Gold, "Political Apologia:" p. 308.

[17]Ware and Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On Generic Criticism of Apologia," p 277.

[18]Gold, "Political Apologia," p. 308.

[19]Ware and Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves," p. 278.

[20]Gold, "Political Apologia," p. 308.

[21]Ware and Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves," p. 280 Psychologically speaking, transcendence moves the audience away from the particular and most likely negative charge at hand.

[22]Ruth Anne Clark and Jesse G Delia, "Topoi and Rhetorical Competence," Quarterly Journal of Speech 65 (1979): p 195.

[23]Karen Tracy, Robert T. Craig, Martin Smith, and Frances Spisak, "The Discourse of Requests: Assessment of a Compliance-Gaining Approach," Human Communication Research 10 (1984): 513-538.

[24]Gerald R Miller and Mark Steinberg, Between People, (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1975).

[25]Gerald Marwell and David R. Schmitt, "Dimensions of Compliance-Gaining Behavior: An Empirical Analysis," Sociometry 39 (1967): 350-364. For further discussion on compliance-gaining strategies see: Franklin J. Boster, and James B. Stiff, "Compliance-Gaining Message Selection Behavior," Human Communication Research 10, 4 (1984), 539-556; Michael J. Cody, and Margaret L. McLaughlin, "Perceptions of Compliance-Gaining Situations: A Dimensional Approach," Communication Monographs, 47 (1980), 132-148; Michael J. Cody, William J. Jordan, and Mary Lou Woelfel, "Dimensions of Compliance-Gaining Situations," Human Communication Research 9 (1983): 99-113; Mark A. deTurk, "A Transactional Analysis of Compliance-Gaining Behavior: Effects of Noncompliance, Relational Contexts, and Actor's Gender," Human Communication Research 12 (1985): 54-78; James P. Dillard, and Michael Burgoon, " Situational Influences on the Selection of Compliance-Gaining Messages: Two Tests of the Predictive Utility of The Cody-McLaughlin Typology," Communication Monographs 52 (1985), 289-304; Marwell and Schmitt, "Dimensions of Compliance-Gaining;" Schenck-Hamlin, et.al., "A Model of Properties of Compliance-Gaining Strategies;" Clark and Delia, "Topoi and Rhetorical Competence;" Karen Tracy, Robert T. Craig, Martin Smith and Frances Spisak, "The Discourse of Requests: Assessment of a Compliance-Gaining Approach," Human Communication Research 10 (1984): 513-538; William J. Schenck-Hamlin, G.N. Georgacarakos, and Richard L. Wiseman, "A Formal Account of Interpersonal Compliance-Gaining," Communication Quarterly 30 (1982): 173-180; M. Lee Williams, and Nancy K. Untermeyer, "Compliance-Gaining Strategies and Communicator Role: An Analysis of Strategy Choices and Persuasive Efficacy,"

Communication Research Reports 5 (1988): 10-18.

[26]William J Schenck-Hamlin, Richard L Wiseman, and GN Georgacarakos, "A Model of Properties of Compliance-Gaining Strategies," Communication Quarterly 30 (1982): p 93.

[27]Ibid., p. 95.

[28]Ibid., p. 95.

[29]Ibid., p. 95.

[30]Ibid., p. 95.

[31]Ibid., p. 95.

[32]Ibid., p. 95.

[33]The other two were Dole versus Mondale in 1976, and Bush versus Ferraro in 1984.

[34]Depending on one's count and one's perceptions, Senator Quayle was querried on this point three or four times.